(1)

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2326 **/2006** SINGLE BENCH

PETITIONER

Santosh Kumar Kashyap, Aged about 27 years, S/o. Shri Mohan Lal Kashyap, R/o. Vinoba Nagar, Boirdadar, Raigarh, Tahsil & District Raigarh (C.G.)

P.R. No. 2365/06
Presented by Shri Roop Nath
dated 21/5/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Higher & Technical Education Department, Mantralaya, D.K.S Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
2/5/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2. The Secretary, Man Power & Planning, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).

3. The Director, Employment & Tranining Mahila Polytechnic Campus, Bairan Bazar Raipur, Tahsil & District Raipur (C.G.)

4. The Joint Director (Training) Industrial Training Institute, Koni, Bilaspur, Tahsil & District Bilaspur. (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(21)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 2326 of 2006

Petitioner : Santosh Kumar Kashyap

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & Others

Shri Roop Naik, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri G.K. Beriwal, Deputy Advocate General with Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Government Advocate for the State.

ORAL ORDER

(5th May, 2006)

1. In this petition the petitioner seeks for following relief:

   7.1 "The respondents be directed to completely follow the prescribed Rules of appointment i.e Chhattisgarh Industrial Training (Non-gazette) Service Recruitment Rules 2005".

   7.2 "The respondents be directed to consider the petitioner's experience having been worked for 3 academic sessions for his recruitment".

   7.3 "Any other relief, which the Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper looking to the facts and circumstances, may also be passed".

2. Shri G.K. Beriwal, Deputy Advocate General appearing for the respondents states that the respondents are under an obligation to comply with all the provisions of Chhattisgarh Industrial (Non-gazette) Services Recruitment Rules 2005 while considering case of the

petitioner for appointment on the post of Visiting Professor.

3. In the event, the petitioner has experience of working three academic sessions and it is provided under provisions of law, the same will also be considered at the time of recruitment/selection of the similarly situated candidates for appointment on the post of Visiting Professor.

4. In view of the above statement made by the learned counsel for the respondents, this petition cannot be entertained, on the basis of anticipated apprehension in the mind of the petitioner.

5. The petition is accordingly dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge